

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-21 and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ghori et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,282,714). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding, claims 25-27 are cancelled.

Regarding claims 1-21, independent claim 1 calls for “packet compressing” a first data stream at a ground segment and then sending the packet compressed first data stream to multiple airborne segments. Claim 1 also call for “bulk compressing” a second data stream at one of the airborne segments and then sending the bulk compressed second data stream to the ground segment. As such, different compression techniques are used on the forward and return links of the data transfer.

The claimed method is particularly advantageous in an aeronautical mobile communication environment where the communications network is divided into a forward link and a return link. Most communicating over the forward link, i.e., ground to air, includes a single transmitting source and multiple recipients. As such, the data transmitted on the forward link typically includes routing information (i.e., a header). By packet compressing the data transmitted on the forward link, some compression is performed to reduce consumed bandwidth thereby increasing efficiency and reducing costs yet the data header is preserved to maintain routing ability.

In contrast, most communicating over the return link, i.e., air to ground, includes multiple transmitting sources and a single recipient. Consequently, the data transmitted on the return link is typically devoid of routing information. By bulk compressing the data transmitted on the return link, maximum compression is achieved since all of the data is compressed to thereby consume a minimum amount of bandwidth while maximizing cost savings and efficiency.

Ghori fails to teach or suggest such a method. Ghori is directed towards a wireless home computer system. Ghori teaches a computer with a first digital wireless transceiver and a home input/output node having a second digital wireless transceiver. Ghori fails to teach a forward link that includes packet compressing a first data stream at a ground segment and then sending the packet compressed first data stream to multiple airborne segments as claimed. Ghori also fails to teach a return link that includes bulk compressing a second data stream at one airborne segment and then sending the bulk compressed second data stream to the ground segment as claimed.

Ghori fails to teach each and every aspect of claim 1. In particular, Ghori fails to teach using different compression techniques on the forward and return links of data transfer. More particularly, Ghori fails to teach packet compression on the forward link and bulk compression on the return link.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Ghori fails to anticipate claim 1. As such, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 2-21 depend from and further define the subject matter of claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-21 are allowable for at least the same

reasons as set forth above with respect to claim 1. It should also be noted that claims 20 and 21 call for different encryption techniques on the forward and return links of the data transfer.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghori in view of Sachdev (U.S. Pat. No. 5,966,442). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Notwithstanding, claims 22-24 are cancelled. Accordingly, this rejection is moot.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 24, 2004

By:



Bryant E. Wade, Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

BEW/cmh